



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/784,856	02/23/2004	Elio Marioni	7202-52	9431

30448 7590 09/02/2005

AKERMAN SENTERFITT
P.O. BOX 3188
WEST PALM BEACH, FL 33402-3188

EXAMINER

PRESTON, ERIK D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2834

DATE MAILED: 09/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/784,856	MARIONI, ELIO	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Erik D. Preston	2834	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/03/2004</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the 1st line of the claim, the phrase "...the other end..." lacks proper antecedent basis and, for examination purposes, will be interpreted as saying "...another end..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the 2nd line of the claim, the phrase "...the free end..." lacks proper antecedent basis and, for examination purposes, will be interpreted as saying "...a free end..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the 8th line of the claim, the phrase "...the motor-supporting axis..." lacks proper antecedent basis and, for examination purposes, will be interpreted as saying "...a motor-supporting axis..." Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 10-15 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim 10 is dependent upon claims 1-9. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims 10-15 have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1,2,4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nakatsuka (JP 2003-047195 supplied by applicant).

With respect to claim 1, Nakatsuka teaches a synchronous electric motor for electrical appliances comprising: A central stator (Fig. 4, #36) fixedly mounted on an axis; a rotor (Fig. 4, #31) having permanent magnets (Fig. 4, #33), being outside the stator and rotatably supported and overhanging on said axis with at least one bearing (Fig. 4, #45) interposed; characterized in that it comprises: A pulley (Fig. 4, #46) rotatably rigid with the rotor; and that said rotor has an essentially cylindrical cup shape with an end wall provided with a hub receiving said bearing, on said hub being inserted a pulley rotatably integral with it.

With respect to claim 2, Nakatsuka teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein said hub is engaged in an end section of said pulley.

With respect to claims 4 & 5, Nakatsuka teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein said pulley has a predetermined number of grooves throughout its length.

With respect to claim 6, Nakatsuka teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein said pulley is attached to said end wall by using fixing means (which inherently exist, or else the motor would not function as it is described).

Claims 1,3,7 & 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stephens et.al. (US 5878934 supplied by applicant).

With respect to claim 1, Stephens teaches a synchronous electric motor for electrical appliances comprising: A central stator (as seen in Fig. 6) fixedly mounted on an axis; a rotor (Fig. 6, #608 & 612) having permanent magnets (Fig. 6, #610), being

Art Unit: 2834

outside the stator and rotatably supported and overhanging on said axis with at least one bearing (Fig. 6, #606) interposed; characterized in that it comprises: A pulley (Fig. 6, #608) rotatably rigid with the rotor; and that said rotor has an essentially cylindrical cup shape with an end wall provided with a hub receiving said bearing, on said hub being inserted a pulley rotatably integral with it.

With respect to claim 3, Stephens teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein said hub is engaged in an end section pulley (the hub is engaged with a bearing at an end portion of the hub) and another end of said pulley is rotatably mounted on said axis with an interposed relevant bearing (Fig. 6, #606).

With respect to claim 7, Stephens teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein said hub is a sleeve being integral with said end wall to receiver inside a pair of bearings; the pulley being integral with one end of the sleeve.

With respect to claim 9, Stephens teaches the motor of claim 1, wherein the diameter of said pulley is essentially equal to the diameter of the rotor.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stephens et al. (US 5878934 supplied by applicant). Stephens teaches the motor of claim 7, but it does not teach that said pulley is removably integral with a free end of said hub.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the pulley removably integral with a free end of the hub since it has been held that making a one piece component into two separate pieces is not considered to be patentably distinct (In re Dulberg, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961)).

Claims 10-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakatsuka (JP 2003-047195 supplied by applicant).

With respect to claim 10, Nakatsuka teaches a method of manufacturing a synchronous motor having a central stator and a permanent-magnet external rotor comprising the steps of: Providing a casing of essentially cylindrical shape, having an end wall centrally provided with a hub; providing a bearing between the hub and a motor supporting axis; attaching a pulley to said hub, but it does not specifically teach a drum being attached to said pulley. However, it would have been obvious to attach a drum to the motor since it has been designed to drive an electrical appliance (Abstract) such as a washing machine, and all conventional washing machines inherently include a drum.

With respect to claim 11, Nakatsuka teaches the method of claim 10, wherein said pulley is attached to said end wall by a fixing means.

With respect to claim 12, Nakatsuka teaches the method of claim 10, but it does not teach that said end wall is removably attached to said cylindrical casing. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the end wall removably attached with the cylindrical casing of the hub since it has been held that making a one piece component into two separate pieces is not

Art Unit: 2834

considered to be patentably distinct (In re Dulberg, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961)).

With respect to claim 13, Nakatsuka teaches the method of claim 10, wherein said pulley is rotatably mounted on said axis with an interposed relevant bearing (the same bearing (Fig. 4, #45), this claim does not make a positive recitation of the motor comprising more than one bearing).

With respect to claim 14, Nakatsuka teaches the method of claim 10, but it does not teach that said pulley is removably integral with a free end of said hub. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to make the pulley removably integral with a free end of the hub since it has been held that making a one piece component into two separate pieces is not considered to be patentably distinct (In re Dulberg, 289 F.2d 522, 523, 129 USPQ 348, 349 (CCPA 1961)).

With respect to claim 15, Nakatsuka teaches the method of claim 1, wherein said pulley is integral with one end of the sleeve.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. US 4629919 & US 6351046.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erik D. Preston whose telephone number is 571-272-8393. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8-5.

Art Unit: 2834

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on 571-272-2044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



08/24/2005


DARREN SCHUBERG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800